

Message

From: Rosalind A. Schoof [rschoof@ramboll.com]
Sent: 11/19/2019 5:19:12 PM
To:

Ex. 6 PP Public Involvement Advisory Group

Subject: RE: Last Night's Health Study Meeting--Comments

Thank you John. Well put.

I interpret your comments to suggest we have separate communications on different issues addressed in the health study report, with which I wholeheartedly agree. Trying to address the HHRAs and cleanup levels, the disease studies and other exposure studies as well as the current blood lead study is bound to be confusing.

I was thinking last night after our call that it would be good to position the public health statement at the beginning of the report as being a statement from the Working Group (in contrast to the report that is by Ramboll with Working Group oversight).

Does that seem reasonable to everyone? As we discussed, that statement could then focus on the blood lead study and RMAP recommendations, with perhaps a very short acknowledgement that other issues/studies are also covered in the report.

We could then go on the craft flyers/brochures/Q&As of no more than 2 pages for a series of other topics covered in the report, including:

1. Risk assessments and cleanup levels (from the working group's perspective)
2. Disease studies (past and future)
3. Exposure studies in addition to the RMAP blood lead studies (past and future)
4. Others?

For such an effort to be useful, it will need to be accompanied by a communications plan that includes a website and outreach activities. If we think such an exercise would be useful, I can work on outlines for the brochures.

Roz

Rosalind A. Schoof

PhD, DABT
Principal - Seattle

D +1 206 336-1653
M +1 206 713-5449
rschoof@ramboll.com

From: John Ray **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 8:07 AM

Ex. 6 PP Public Involvement Advisory Group

Ex. 6 PP Public Involvement Advisory Group

Subject: Last Night's Health Study Meeting--Comments

Submitted by: John W. Ray

Mr. Charles Partridge made three particularly prescient comments during last evening's Health Study Meeting that I think should guide us going forward:

1. That all risk cannot be removed from society.
2. That Superfund was designed to lessen the risk's posed by the toxics of concern.
3. The Health Study makes clear that in the area of lead contamination the RMAP program under the auspices of EPA and the generosity of ARCO as implemented by BSB has made significant progress in lessening lead contamination and exposure in Butte.

Why and how do I say that this should guide us?

As I have said before, the report is directed at two audiences—the agencies in order to make a determination as to whether or not RMAP has been effective and the public in order to make a determination as to whether or not Superfund has been effective in mitigating the risk associated with lead exposure in children.

The complete report with appendices, etc. should satisfy the regulatory agency requirement. But the full report is not an effective vehicle for reaching the general public. It is long, complex, technically written, etc.

Therefore, in order to reach the public we need a simple yet accurate condensation of the report.

That is why I would recommend a one page summary statement of the health study results presented in arch as way that a lay person can understand it.

There could also be a six or seven page executive summary that points to way in more detail to what the report did and could refer to the full report. Of course, there is the full report for those who want to tackle it.

Now let us return to what Mr. Partridge said last evening that I summarized in the first part of this message.

The public wants to know if Butte is a safe place. The public wants to know if Superfund has been effective. Of course, the answer to the question of whether or not Butte is a safe place to live goes far beyond Superfund. Superfund does not address suicide, it doesn't address the drug problem, it does not address smoking, it does not address diet, it does not address exercise, and so on.

But addressing what Superfund has contributed to making Butte safe should be the focus of the summary. Lead levels in children have gone down. Arsenic studies seem

to be reassuring. Anecdotal evidence from RMAP would indicate that mercury is not a problem.

That needs to be emphasized in the summary.

The public is also confused by what appears to be a plethora of studies, some of which do not paint the optimistic public health picture that the Health Study Report does.

To that end, I would make this suggestions and I don't know if this would be in the purview of our committee, that a sort summary of all the recent health studies of Butte be prepared. This summary would summarize the conclusions of each of these studies and could indicate any limitations of the study. Once this is done, a summary statement that sums up the overall message the public can derive from the studies could be prepared. The summary statement of the studies could indicate where the preponderance of evidence lies regarding public health and the toxics of concern in Butte and Superfund. This is what the public wants to know. This is what people thinking of moving to Butte or businesses thinking of relocating to Butte want to know.

Right now I think that the public is confused. This study can help deal with that confusion. An annotated summary with conclusions of all recent health studies regarding Butte would help deal with the confusion. If we want to reach the public, we need to make our produce more accessible to the interested public. Also remember, that most people will get their information not from directly reading the report but from the media which, of necessity, will condense the story. We should aid them in that task. If we don't provide a readily accessible summer to public and press this will be seen as just another study which after receiving momentary attention will be "put on the back shelf" so to speak.

I would hope we fully support the continuance and expansion of the RMAP program--a nationally recognized lead abatement program. I would hope that we develop and implement an expanded public outreach program that would acquaint families and individuals with what they can do to lessen exposure to and the effect of exposure to the toxics of concern. I would hope particular emphasis would be placed on environmental justice issues.

Butte Superfund is making progress. The risk is being lessened, The public health is being improved. Currently, to this end I am much encouraged by the cooperation between local government, EPA, MDEQ and ARCO to this end. We should build on this.

We can never eliminate all risk but we have on the ground a most effective program at reducing risk to the maximum feasible extent..